



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,471	11/19/2003	Seiji Kachi	NEC03P167-Mlc	3737
21254 7590 04/28/2009 MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817				
EXAMINER PHUONG, DAI				
ART UNIT 2617		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/28/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/715,471

**Applicant(s)**

KACHI, SEIJI

**Examiner**

DAI A. PHUONG

**Art Unit**

2617

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/09/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 7-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Argument***

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 01/09/2009, with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. .

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walke et al. (U.S. 7095722) in view of Margon (Pub. No.: 20030214933).

Regarding claim 1, Walke et al. disclose a method of limiting communication access between wireless LAN terminals of a wireless LAN (Fig. 1), comprising:

setting default gateways of the respective wireless LAN terminals as a single access limiter (fig. 1, col. 1, line 47 to col. 2, line 65); and

returning a communication packet between the wireless LAN terminals from said access limiter which is set as said default gateways, for thereby providing an access limiting function to limit communication access between the wireless LAN (col. 4, line 18 to col. 5, line 22).

However, Walke et al. do not disclose allocating different subnetwork addresses to respective wireless LAN terminals in a wireless LAN access point.

In an analogous art, Margon discloses allocating different subnetwork addresses to respective wireless LAN terminals in a wireless LAN access point (fig. 5. Margon, paragraph 38 and paragraph 39, discloses the base Station 102 can dynamically communicate with Remote Stations 104 in a number of different addressing. The address of each Remote Station 104 can correspond to the IP address of that Remote Station 104. Another advantage of using the IP protocol as an addressing scheme is the ability to **create zones that correspond to one or more sub-networks of the IP network.** Accordingly, such embodiments of the invention can be configured so that a subset of the Remote Stations 104 exist in one IP sub-network or zone. Furthermore, Margon, paragraph 51 to paragraph 52, discloses the network system 500 comprises a first zone 510, Zone 1; a second zone 520, Zone 2; and a third zone 530, Zone 3. Each zone groups a number of Remote Stations 104 located in a given physical region. The number of remote Stations 104 assigned **ID addresses 1 through 100 are configured in Zone 1 and the number of Remote Stations assigned ID address 101 through 256** are configured in Zone 2. In other words, the base station 102 allocates different subnetwork addresses to each zone and the number of remote stations (wireless LAN terminals) in each zone has different subnetwork addresses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically allocating different subnetwork addresses to respective wireless LAN terminals in a wireless LAN access point, as taught by Morgan, the motivation being in order to allow the maintenance of a single base station in a spacious geographical area while minimizing the cost of the hardware at the remote station due to their grouping in zones of smaller geographic areas. Increased efficiency is achieved by

moving intelligence to the Remote Stations so that propagation delays to the base station do not reduce system throughput and also maintain the bandwidth is available in the system.

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan disclose all limitations in claim 1. Further, Walke et al. disclose a method wherein providing the access limiting function to limit communication access between the wireless LAN terminals is done without modifying the existing wireless LAN access point (col. 4, line 18 to col. 5, line 22).

4. Claims 9, 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walke et al. in view of Margon (Pub. No.: 20030214933) and further in view of Lor et al. (Pub. No.: 20040068668).

Regarding claim 9, Walke et al. a wireless LAN system (fig. 1), comprising:

a wireless LAN access point configured to wirelessly associate with a plurality of wireless terminals (fig. 1, col. 4, line 18 to col. 5, line 22).

However, Walke et al. do not an access limiter configured to control communications between a first of the plurality of the wireless terminals and a second of the plurality of the wireless terminals at the wireless LAN access point, wherein the first wireless terminal and the second wireless terminal communicate through the access limiter, and wherein each of the first wireless terminal and the second wireless terminal are allocated different subnetwork addresses.

In an analogous art, Margon discloses allocating different subnetwork addresses to respective wireless LAN terminals in a wireless LAN access point (fig. 5. Margon, paragraph 38 and paragraph 39, discloses the base Station 102 can dynamically communicate with Remote

Stations 104 in a number of different addressing. The address of each Remote Station 104 can correspond to the IP address of that Remote Station 104. Another advantage of using the IP protocol as an addressing scheme is the ability to create zones that correspond to one or more sub-networks of the IP network. Accordingly, such embodiments of the invention can be configured so that a subset of the Remote Stations 104 exist in one IP sub-network or zone. Furthermore, Margon, paragraph 51 to paragraph 52, discloses the network system 500 comprises a first zone 510, Zone 1; a second zone 520, Zone 2; and a third zone 530, Zone 3. Each zone groups a number of Remote Stations 104 located in a given physical region. The number of remote Stations 104 assigned ID addresses 1 through 100 are configured in Zone 1 and the number of Remote Stations assigned ID address 101 through 256 are configured in Zone 2. In other words, the base station 102 allocates different subnetwork addresses to each zone and the number of remote stations (wireless LAN terminals) in each zone has different subnetwork addresses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically allocating different subnetwork addresses to respective wireless LAN terminals in a wireless LAN access point, as taught by Morgan, the motivation being in order to allow the maintenance of a single base station in a spacious geographical area while minimizing the cost of the hardware at the remote station due to their grouping in zones of smaller geographic areas. Increased efficiency is achieved by moving intelligence to the Remote Stations so that propagation delays to the base station do not reduce system throughput and also maintain the bandwidth is available in the system.

However, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan do not disclose an access limiter configured to control communications between a first of the plurality of the wireless terminals and a second of the plurality of the wireless terminals at the wireless LAN access point, wherein the first wireless terminal and the second wireless terminal communicate through the access limiter.

In an analogous art, Lor et al. disclose an access limiter (WLAN switch, 106 and 107) configured to control communications between a first of the plurality of the wireless terminals and a second of the plurality of the wireless terminals at the wireless LAN access point (fig. 1, [0031]. Lor et al. disclose the wireless devices, 120-129 are connected to the enterprise network via the Access Points 111-115 which communicate and control by the WLAN switch)

wherein the first wireless terminal and the second wireless terminal communicate through the access limiter (fig. 1, [0031]. Lor et al. disclose the wireless devices, 120-129 are connected to the enterprise network via the Access Points, 111-115, which in turn are the edge devices of the wired LAN. The Access Points, 111-115, are connected to the LAN via switches, 106 and 107. These switches, called Wireless LAN Switches, do not only perform Layer 2 switching, but also act as a wireless edge manager. Therefore, the WLAN switch communicates and controls the wireless devices, 120-129 via the Access Points, 111-115).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically an access limiter configured to control communications between a first of the plurality of the wireless terminals and a second of the plurality of the wireless terminals at the wireless LAN access point, wherein the first wireless terminal and the second wireless terminal communicate through the access

limiter, as taught by Lor et al., the motivation being in order to control a flow of data between mobile.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. disclose all limitations in claim 9. Further, Lor et al. disclose a method wherein the access limiter 106 is configured as a default gateway for the plurality of wireless terminals (col. 4, line 18 to col. 5, line 22).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. disclose all limitations in claim 11. Further, Lor et al. disclose a method further comprising a wired terminal configured to associate with the access limiter (col. 4, line 18 to col. 5, line 22).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. disclose all limitations in claim 12. However, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. do not disclose a method wherein the wireless access point receives an address resolution protocol request from the first wireless terminal and transmits the address resolution protocol request to the access limiter and to the second wireless terminal, and wherein the access limiter returns the request and the second wireless terminal drops the request.

In an analogous art, Lor et al. disclose a method wherein the wireless access point receives an address resolution protocol request from the first wireless terminal and transmits the address resolution protocol request to the access limiter and to the second wireless terminal, and wherein the access limiter returns the request and the second wireless terminal drops the request ([0038] to [0077]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically the wireless access



point receives an address resolution protocol request from the first wireless terminal and transmits the address resolution protocol request to the access limiter and to the second wireless terminal, and wherein the access limiter returns the request and the second wireless terminal drops the request, as taught by Lor et al., the motivation being in order to control a flow of data between mobile.

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. disclose all limitations in claim 9. However, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. do not disclose a method wherein when the first wireless terminal transmits a packet intended for the second wireless terminal to the access limiter, the access limiter detects that the packet is intended for the second wireless terminal and drops the packet.

In an analogous art, Lor et al. disclose a method wherein when the first wireless terminal transmits a packet intended for the second wireless terminal to the access limiter, the access limiter detects that the packet is intended for the second wireless terminal and drops the packet ([0055] and [0117] to [0134]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically a method wherein when the first wireless terminal transmits a packet intended for the second wireless terminal to the access limiter, the access limiter detects that the packet is intended for the second wireless terminal and drops the packet, as taught by Lor et al., the motivation being in order to control a flow of data between mobile.

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. disclose all limitations in claim 9. However, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. do not disclose the first wireless terminal transmits a packet intended for the second wireless terminal to the access limiter, the access limiter performs priority control over the packet among a plurality of received packets.

In an analogous art, Lor et al. disclose the first wireless terminal transmits a packet intended for the second wireless terminal to the access limiter, the access limiter performs priority control over the packet among a plurality of received packets ([0012] and [0121] to [0128]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically the first wireless terminal transmits a packet intended for the second wireless terminal to the access limiter, the access limiter performs priority control over the packet among a plurality of received packets, as taught by Lor et al., the motivation being in order to control a flow of data between mobile.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lor et al. (Pub. No.: 20040068668) in view of Margon (Pub. No.: 20030214933).

Regarding claim 17, Lor et al. disclose a wireless network router (fig. 1), comprising:

A wireless access point 111-115 (fig. 1, [0031])

an access limiter (WLAN 106 and 107) comprising a plurality of Local Address Network (LAN) interfaces associated to the wireless access point (fig. 1 and [0031]), the access limiter comprising:

an access limiting apparatus to pass or drop a received packet to thereby inhibit or permit communications between a plurality of wireless terminals (fig. 1 and [0048] to [0055]); and

a routing apparatus for distributing packets selectively between the wireless LAN access point depending on a destination of the packets between the plurality of wireless terminals (fig. 1 and [0048] to [0055]),

wherein communication between any of the plurality of wireless terminals is routed through the access limiter (fig. 1 and [0048] to [0055]).

However, Lor et al. do not disclose each of the wireless terminals are allocated different subnetwork addresses.

In an analogous art, Margon discloses each of the wireless terminals are allocate different subnetwork addresses (fig. 5. Margon, paragraph 38 and paragraph 39, discloses the base Station 102 can dynamically communicate with Remote Stations 104 in a number of different addressing. The address of each Remote Station 104 can correspond to the IP address of that Remote Station 104. Another advantage of using the IP protocol as an addressing scheme is the ability to create zones that correspond to one or more sub-networks of the IP network. Accordingly, such embodiments of the invention can be configured so that a subset of the Remote Stations 104 exist in one IP sub-network or zone. Furthermore, Margon, paragraph 51 to paragraph 52, discloses the network system 500 comprises a first zone 510, Zone 1; a second zone 520, Zone 2; and a third zone 530, Zone 3. Each zone groups a number of Remote Stations 104 located in a given physical region. The number of remote Stations 104 assigned **ID**

addresses 1 through 100 are configured in Zone 1 and the number of Remote Stations assigned ID address 101 through 256 are configured in Zone 2. In other words, the base station 102 allocates different subnetwork addresses to each zone and the number of remote stations (wireless LAN terminals) in each zone has different subnetwork addresses.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Lor et al. by specifically each of the wireless terminals are allocate different subnetwork addresses, as taught by Morgan, the motivation being in order to allow the maintenance of a single base station in a spacious geographical area while minimizing the cost of the hardware at the remote station due to their grouping in zones of smaller geographic areas. Increased efficiency is achieved by moving intelligence to the Remote Stations so that propagation delays to the base station do not reduce system throughput and also maintain the bandwidth is available in the system.

6. Claims 2-3, 7, 10, 16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walke et al. in view of Margon (Pub. No.: 20030214933) and further in view of Lor et al. (Pub. No.: 20040068668) and further in view of Whelan et al. (Pub. No.: 20040203593).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan disclose all limitations in claim 1. However, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan do not disclose a method wherein said access limiter has two LAN interfaces connected respectively to a wired terminal 101 and the wireless LAN access point, said wireless LAN terminals being connected to said wireless LAN access point, said access limiter comprising:

an access limiting function for passing or dropping a received packet to thereby inhibit or permit communications between the terminals; a band limiting function for buffering a received packet to process audio packets with priority over other packets; a routing function for distributing packets selectively to said wired terminal and said wireless LAN access point depending on a destination of the packets; a DHCP server for allocating IP addresses having different subnets for the respective terminals in response to DHCP requests from said wired LAN terminals; and an ARP server installed in an existing IP protocol stack.

In an analogous art, Lor et al. disclose a method wherein said access limiter 106 (see Fig. 1) has two LAN interfaces connected respectively to a wired terminal 101 and the wireless LAN access point 111-112, said wireless LAN terminals 120-122 being connected to said wireless LAN access point 111-112, said access limiter 106 comprising:

an access limiting function for passing or dropping a received packet to thereby inhibit or permit communications between the terminals ([0031] and [0047] to [0055]);

a band limiting function for buffering a received packet to process audio packets with priority over other packets ([0055] and [0121] to [0128]);

a routing function for distributing packets selectively to said wired terminal and said wireless LAN access point depending on a destination of the packets ([0055] and [0124] and table 2 to table 3);

a server for allocating IP addresses having different subnets for the respective terminals in response to address requests from said wired LAN terminals (Fig. 5 and Fig. 7, [0021], , 0027], [0050], [0074] to [0075]); and

an ARP server installed in an existing IP protocol stack ([0077]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically an access limiting function for passing or dropping a received packet to thereby inhibit or permit communications between the terminals; a band limiting function for buffering a received packet to process audio packets with priority over other packets; a routing function for distributing packets selectively to said wired terminal and said wireless LAN access point depending on a destination of the packets; a DHCP server for allocating IP addresses having different subnets for the respective terminals in response to DHCP requests from said wired LAN terminals; and an ARP server installed in an existing IP protocol stack, as taught by Lor et al., the motivation being in order to control a flow of data between mobile.

However, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. do not disclose a DHCP server for allocating IP addresses having different subnets for the respective terminals in response to DHCP requests from said wired LAN terminals.

In the same field of endeavor, Whelan et al. disclose a DHCP server for allocating IP addresses having different subnets for the respective terminals in response to DHCP requests from said wired LAN terminals ([0088] to [0095]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically including a DHCP server for allocating IP addresses having different subnets for the respective terminals in response to DHCP requests from said wired LAN terminals, as taught by Whelan et al., the

motivation being in order to allocate IP address to the mobile unit which is associated with an access point.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Walke et al., and Morgan and Lor and Whelan et al. disclose all limitations in claim 2. Further, Whelan et al. disclose a method wherein when a first one of the wireless LAN terminals is turned on, said first wireless LAN terminal sends a DHCP request to the wireless LAN access point for automatically resolving its own IP address; said wireless LAN access point, which operates as a simple bridge between a wireless LAN and a wired LAN, transfers the received DHCP request to the access limiter; said access limiter, which has a DHCP server function, returns a DHCP response to the DHCP request to said wireless LAN access point; and said wireless LAN access point, which has received the DHCP response, converts the DHCP response from wired data to wireless data, sends the DHCP response to said first wireless LAN terminal to allow said first wireless LAN terminal to make IP communications according to IP address information allocated from the DHCP server; wherein when a second one of the wireless LAN terminals is turned on, said second wireless LAN terminal sends a DHCP request to the wireless LAN access point for automatically resolving its own IP address; said wireless LAN access point, which operates as the simple bridge between a wireless LAN and a wired LAN, transfers the received DHCP request to the access limiter; said access limiter, which has the DHCP server function, returns a DHCP response to the DHCP request to said wireless LAN access point; and said wireless LAN access point, which has received the DHCP response, converts the DHCP response from wired data to wireless data, sends the DHCP response to said second wireless LAN terminal to allow said second wireless LAN terminal to make IP communications according to IP address information allocated from

the DHCP server; wherein said first wireless LAN terminal sends a packet destined for said second wireless LAN terminal to said access limiter; and said access limiter transfers the received packet, which is destined for said second wireless LAN terminal, to said second wireless LAN terminal ([0088] to [0095]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Lor et al. by specifically including a method wherein when a first one of the wireless LAN terminals is turned on, said first wireless LAN terminal sends a DHCP request to the wireless LAN access point for automatically resolving its own IP address; said wireless LAN access point, which operates as a simple bridge between a wireless LAN and a wired LAN, transfers the received DHCP request to the access limiter; said access limiter, which has a DHCP server function, returns a DHCP response to the DHCP request to said wireless LAN access point; and said wireless LAN access point, which has received the DHCP response, converts the DHCP response from wired data to wireless data, sends the DHCP response to said first wireless LAN terminal to allow said first wireless LAN terminal to make IP communications according to IP address information allocated from the DHCP server; wherein when a second one of the wireless LAN terminals is turned on, said second wireless LAN terminal sends a DHCP request to the wireless LAN access point for automatically resolving its own IP address; said wireless LAN access point, which operates as the simple bridge between a wireless LAN and a wired LAN, transfers the received DHCP request to the access limiter; said access limiter, which has the DHCP server function, returns a DHCP response to the DHCP request to said wireless LAN access point; and said wireless LAN access point, which has received the DHCP response, converts the DHCP response from wired



data to wireless data, sends the DHCP response to said second wireless LAN terminal to allow said second wireless LAN terminal to make IP communications according to IP address information allocated from the DHCP server; wherein said first wireless LAN terminal sends a packet destined for said second wireless LAN terminal to said access limiter; and said access limiter transfers the received packet, which is destined for said second wireless LAN terminal, to said second wireless LAN terminal, as taught by Whelan et al., the motivation being in order to allocate IP address to the mobile unit which is associated with an access point.

Regarding claim 7, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. disclose all limitations in claim 9. However, Walke et al. do not disclose the wireless LAN system further comprising a dynamic host configuration protocol configured to return a dynamic host protocol configuration request received from one of the plurality of wireless terminals, the returned dynamic protocol configuration request being a subnet different from subnetwork addresses assigned to the other of each of the plurality of wireless terminals.

In the same field of endeavor, Whelan et al. disclose a dynamic host configuration protocol configured to return a dynamic host protocol configuration request received from one of the plurality of wireless terminals, the returned dynamic protocol configuration request being a subnet different from subnetwork addresses assigned to the other of each of the plurality of wireless terminals ([0088] to [0095]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically including a dynamic host configuration protocol configured to return a dynamic host protocol configuration request

received from one of the plurality of wireless terminals, the returned dynamic protocol configuration request being a subnet different from subnetwork addresses assigned to the other of each of the plurality of wireless terminals, as taught by Whelan et al., the motivation being in order to allocate IP address to the mobile unit which is associated with an access point.

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Walke et al. and Morgan and Lor et al. disclose all limitations in claim 9. However, Walke et al. do not disclose the wireless LAN system further comprising a dynamic host protocol configuration server configured to allocate IP address having different subnets for respective wireless terminals that are wirelessly associated with the access point.

In the same field of endeavor, Whelan et al. disclose a dynamic host protocol configuration server configured to allocate IP address having different subnets for respective wireless terminals that are wirelessly associated with the access point ([0088] to [0095]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walke et al. by specifically including a dynamic host protocol configuration server configured to allocate IP address having different subnets for respective wireless terminals that are wirelessly associated with the access point, as taught by Whelan et al., the motivation being in order to allocate IP address to the mobile unit which is associated with an access point.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 3.

Regarding claim 19, this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 7.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 4-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Conclusion**

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dai A Phuong whose telephone number is 571-272-7896. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-7503.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dai A Phuong/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2617  
Date: 04/16/2009  
/Patrick N. Edouard/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626